

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action mailed October 19, 2007. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-42 were pending in the Application. Applicant amends Claims 1, 14, 15, 26, 27, 40, 41, and 42 without prejudice or disclaimer. The amendments to these claims are not the result of any prior art reference and, thus, do not narrow the scope of any of the claims. Furthermore, the amendments are not related to patentability issues and only further clarify subject matter already present. All of Applicant's amendments have only been done in order to advance prosecution in this case. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims and favorable action in this case and, further, is hopeful of a full allowance of the pending claims.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objects to Claims 14, 26, and 40 because of the following informalities: The word "outgoing" should be changed to "outgoing." Applicant has made a series of amendments to address the Examiner's concerns.

Section 101 Rejections

Claims 27-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because "the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant hereby defers this issue until the substantive patentability of the pending claims is resolved. In the alternative, Applicant is certainly open to a suggested Examiner Amendment to cure this issue and comply with the ever-changing guidance from the USPTO in regards to §101 issues.

Section 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-8, 10-20, 22-34, and 36-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,577,726 issued to Huang et al. (hereinafter "*Huang*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.¹ In addition, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claims" and "[t]he elements must be arranged as

¹ *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP §2131.

required by the claim.”² In regard to inherency of a reference, “[t]he fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic.”³ Thus, in relying upon the theory of inherency, an Examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art.⁴

There is a host of potential arguments Applicant could posit at this juncture. However, just to expedite the prosecution of the instant case, and as a courtesy to the Examiner, Applicant has made an amendment in order to clearly elucidate the allowability of the pending claims. Currently, no reference of record, including *Huang*, offers an architecture in which the user can be *concurrently logged on at multiple endpoints*. This provides another level of sophistication to the system and, further, gives the user enhanced flexibility. These limitations are provided for in Independent Claim 1, but no reference of record includes or teaches such elements.

For at least these reasons, Independent Claim 1 is allowable over any cited reference. The other Independent Claims recite limitations similar, but not identical, to those recited in Independent Claim 1. Therefore, these claims are also allowable, for example, for the same reasons as identified above. Additionally, the corresponding dependent claims from these Independent Claims are also patentably distinct for analogous reasons.

Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 9, 21 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Huang* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,933,488 to Marcus (hereinafter “*Marcus*”). This rejection is now moot in light of the §102 analysis provided above.

Thus, all of the pending claims have been shown to be allowable, as they are patentable over the references of record. Notice to this effect is respectfully requested in the form of a full allowance of these pending claims.

² *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *In re Bond*, 15 USPQ 2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990); MPEP §2131 (*emphasis added*).

³ MPEP §2112 (citing *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ 2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (*emphasis in original*)).

⁴ MPEP §2112 (citing *Ex Parte Levy*, 17 USPQ 2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. at App. and Inter. 1990) (*emphasis in original*)).

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for all other reasons clear and apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Applicant believes no fees are due; however, if this is not correct the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to advance prosecution of this application, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Thomas J. Frame at 214.953.6675.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant


Thomas J. Frame
Reg. No. 47,232

Date: January 4, 2008
Customer No. 05073